

PITMANESE PHONETICS.

Introduction to English, French, and German Phonetics, with Reading Lessons and Exercises. By Laura Soames. New Edition revised and edited by Wilhelm Vietor, Ph.D., M.A. Pp. xxvii + 178 + 89. (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., Ltd., 1899.)

THIS new edition of Miss Soames's work, which was designed by the authoress to provide a convenient method of teaching the pronunciation of the English, French and German languages, will no doubt prove useful to those teachers who believe in the advisability of teaching pronunciation by means of Pitmanese. The book is in no sense a scientific treatise on phonetics; the portion which deals with the production of the sounds of the three languages treated of is simply a very good and useful exposition of the obvious: the main point of the book is the elaboration for teaching purposes of a phonetic alphabet which in many respects falls far short of our ideal of what a phonetic alphabet should be, if such a thing need be constructed for teaching or any other purpose at all, except for the use of scientific students of linguistic phenomena. *E.g.* the authoress uses "a" to express the indeterminate vowel-sound: now nobody ever pronounced *the* as "dha"; when it is not fully pronounced "dhi," it is pronounced as a German would pronounce "dhö": to write it "dha" is most misleading. Also, the final *-er* in English absolutely = the German *ö*; *crozier* is pronounced "krözyö," though Miss Soames would tell us to pronounce it "krözhar." She writes *gardener* as "gädnar": now if we pronounce a true *r* in *gardener* at all, it is most certainly in the first syllable (where it is usually sounded as a faint guttural, a sort of feeble *ayin*), and *not* at the end of the word: *gárdnö* or *gädñö*. Generally speaking, Miss Soames connives at the tendency of modern English to weaken the *r*, and represents it as being far weaker than it really is: in the same way the tendency to lose the distinction between *witch* and *which* is in no way combated by Miss Soames. She spells, most inconsistently, "when," "which," instead of "hwen," "hwich" (hwič), the proper phonetic spelling. Again, to teach a child to pronounce *Sassenach* as "Sasínæk" (Pt. i. p. 109), and *Lochinvar* as "Lokínvar" (Pt. ii. p. 64), is an extremely slipshod proceeding, if it be not a mere solecism on the part of the authoress.

In the German phonetic spelling one or two weak points may also be pointed out. The expression of hard *ch* by *x* is a mistake: this appears to give the ordinary symbol for *ks* in the Latin alphabet a value which it does not possess: every learner cannot be expected to know that the Greek X (Russian x), which does possess the value of hard *ch*, has been transported into Miss Soames's phonetic alphabet to express this value. It would have been better to have used the small Greek type and have written *Nacht* "Naxt," not "Naxt." We do not like the adoption of *ç* to represent final *-g* after front vowels and consonants, as in *Sieg*, *Berg*, &c., either; a wrong primary impression is again given, and the fact is lost sight of that it is an *h*-sound, not a *k*-sound, which is in question. Why not use the symbol well-known in the transliteration of Egyptian and Assyrian, *h*, for this sound, keeping *x* for hard *ch* and final *-g* in *Tag*, &c.? *Sieg* would

NO 1601, VOL. 62]

then be phonetically written "Zih." Miss Soames also made *ç* stand for the *ch*-sound in *manches*; this is incorrect, *ch* here = "hy" ("månhyez"), a sound quite distinct from the final *-h* of *Sieg*.

The authoress appended a list of "Loan words used in English," a large portion of which is made up of words and phrases which are not loan words at all; *e.g.* *ancien régime* (!), *abattoir* (!!), and *Aphrodite* (!!!). On the other hand, such words as *abatis*, *acolade*, *aegis*, or *aguillette* (which is presumably what the authoress means by "aguille"), *are* loan words. In this list some mistakes of pronunciation occur, *e.g.* *a fortiori* should be pronounced on Miss Soames's system "ey förtiô'rai," not "fôshiô'rai," a vulgarism which no person with the slightest intelligent knowledge of Latin would ever think of using; *anacoluthon* should be pronounced "ænako'lû'tho'n, sounding the *o*, not "ænako'lyû'than"; *Canaan* "Kanâ'an," not "Keynan"; *Koran* "Karân," not "Kôrân"; and *sheikh* "shêç" (German "Scheech"), not "shîk," which is a terrible mispronunciation. On p. 104, *Eisteädfoðd* is given a superfluous final *d*; and on p. 99, the misprint *Bacchas* is noticeable.

On the whole, while this work may be regarded as generally useful for the purpose for which it is intended, it is unluckily marred by a tendency to perpetuate many incorrect and vulgar pronunciations, and even by several mistakes, some of them merely slipshod, others due to ignorance, which the reviser ought to have corrected.

OUR BOOK SHELF.

Psychologie der Naturvölker. By Dr. J. Schultze. Pp. xii + 392. (Leipzig: Veit and Co., 1900.)

IN this study of primitive culture, Dr. Schultze passes under review, from the standpoint of the psychologist, the material which is the common heritage of the anthropologists of to-day. Spite of the suspicions aroused by a sub-title of nineteen words, Dr. Schultze's volume is an unpretentious bit of work by a competent writer, whom no phantasy of construction or love of paradox has led astray from the patient use of authorities and the exercise of a sober judgment. Dr. Schultze's first essays in his subject were printed some thirty years ago. The present contribution is self-contained, though for its author it is but a part of a larger whole, prelude by physiological psychology and a treatise on the psychical life of plant and brute, and to be followed by a study of childhood. It is naturally evolutionist in conception, although the descriptive continuity which the author maintains is accompanied by the refusal to allow that the derivation of apperceptive consciousness from associational, which in the interests of a unitary view of nature he might desiderate, has been adequately made out. A feature of the book is the use made of English authorities. Not only Spencer and Tylor, but McLennan and Lubbock supply the writer with important doctrines, *e.g.* in his account of the evolution of marriage. Mr. Sutherland's "Origin and Growth of the Moral Instinct" is recognised as having anticipated Dr. Schultze in much which he would have been glad to have said, but, far from being dismissed with a *pereat*, is summarised in an appendix. It is on fetishism and animism that Dr. Schultze is most at home. Not that there is not much else of interest on the alleged superiority of vision among savages, on the concreteness of their philology, on the relation of rhythm to melody, on the difference of the sexes in regard to the sense of smell, on the evolution of the sense for landscape, and the like. But to the topics